UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/498,944	02/04/2000	Christopher Warnock	EBRY0001	9493

22862 7590 09/23/2005

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER	
LE, NANCY LOAN T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3621	

DATE MAILED: 09/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/498,944	WARNOCK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NANCY LOAN T. LE	3621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 May 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,15,17-21,55-75 and 78-85* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-3,15,17-21,55-75 and 78-85* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4/26/05 & 4/27/05*.
4) ☒ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. *20050908* .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is responsive to amendment filed on 17 May 2005 in which claims 1, 55, 57, 67 are amended; claims 4-14, 16, 22-26, 76-77 are canceled; and all other claims remain the same.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-3, 15, 17-21, 55-75, 78-85 have been examined and are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 26 and 27 April 2005 were filed after the mailing date of the first office action of 02/17/2005 and before the mailing date of the second office action which is this action. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments, see 'Applicant's arguments or remarks made in an Amendment', filed 17 May 2005, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3, 15, 21, 55-61, 66-85 under Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,247,575, 9/21/1993 (see last office action of 17 February 2005) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the previous rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,532,920, published on 02 July 1996.

5. Previous indication of claims 17-19, 62-65 in the last office action of 17 February 2005 as being 'allowable' is now withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. §102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3, 15, 17-18, 56, 59, 63-64, 66-69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,532,920, published 02 July 1996.

As per **claim 1**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising:

- providing a user a first user viewable version of the actual contents of documents residing at a server on a first cost basis, said first user viewable version being protected to prevent the user from performing standard operations on said version such as copying, printing or saving (i.e., the user also applies a royalty payment program in conjunction with the softcopy book reading program. If the user enters a command to copy ... or to print ... or to transmit a copy of the book over a modem, the royalty payment program intercepts the copying command and suspends the copying operations – see col. 4, lines 58-65);
- calculating a charge to permit the user to perform a requested action on a user-selected portion of document content on a second cost basis (i.e., Instead, the royalty payment program presents the user with a display of the royalty payment information stored in the book text or in a file accompanying the book. The user must select the option of paying a royalty to the publisher before the royalty payment program permits a copy of the book to be made – see col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 1-3);
- providing a second version of the user-selected portion on which a user requested action is completed upon payment of the calculated charge (i.e., After checking that the user's offered mode of payment is effective, the publisher's data processor sends back to the user's royalty payment program an authorization message to make the proposed copy. The royalty payment program in the user's workstation then recommences the copying operation which was suspended, allowing the proposed copy of the book to be made – see col. 5, lines 26-32).

As per **claims 2 and 68**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claims 1 and 67, respectively, wherein calculating the charge further comprises:

- calculating the charge on the basis of the granularity of the user-selected portion including whole and partial pages (i.e., The royalty payment information contained in the structured document text of the softcopy book or in the royalty information file ... can include royalty payment information on individual chapters of the book, as well as on the entire book – see col. 5, lines 4-13; figures 3A-3C, 4A-4B, 5).

As per **claims 3 and 69**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claims {1 or 2}, and 67, respectively, wherein calculating the charge further comprises:

- calculating the charge based in-part on the action requested (i.e., If the user is displaying a particular chapter of the book at his workstation at the time he enters the copying command, the royalty payment program displays royalty payment information for the current chapter being displayed, ... -- see col. 5, lines 8-13).

As per **claim 15**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 1 wherein calculating the charge further comprises:

- calculating said charge in-part on a network address from which said user accesses said server (i.e., When the user selects to pay the royalty, a communication session is established between the user's workstation {inherently identified and represented by a unique network address} and the publisher's data processor, for example, by placing a call through a modem and over the public telephone network. A message is sent by the royalty payment program to the publisher's data processor, ... so that the publisher's data processor can compute the royalty amount the user is to pay – see col. 5, lines 14-25).

As per **claim 17**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 1 further comprising:

- presenting the calculated cost to the user, and receiving user authorization for payment of the calculated charge (i.e., When the user selects to pay the royalty, ... {with provided information such as the user's name, mailing address, credit card number, or other billing information} – see col. 5, lines 14-23).

As per **claim 18**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 17 further comprising:

- checking a user's default options and providing authorization according to said default options (i.e., After checking that the user's offered mode of payment is effective, the publisher's data processor sends back to the user's royalty payment program, an authorization message to make the proposed copy – see col. 5, lines 26-29).

As per **claim 56**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 55 further comprising:

- using client-side software for permitting the user to view the encrypted format of the first version (i.e., the user applies a "*special softcopy book reading program*" at his workstation, which reconverts the compacted, tokenized, encrypted text into the structured document text, which is then capable of being displayed on a display device for the user's viewing – see col. 4, lines 53-57).

As per **claim 59**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 57 wherein providing the second version further comprises:

- providing document content in a form not directly accessible by the user (i.e., The book is stored on the storage medium as a compacted, tokenized, encrypted text such that to read the book from the storage disk, the user must apply a special softcopy book reading program at his workstation, which reconverts the compacted, tokenized, encrypted text into the structured document source text, which is then capable of being displayed on a display device – see col. 4, lines 51-57).

As per **claim 63**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 60, wherein providing the first version further comprises:

- sending images of a page of the document content one at a time to the user for viewing (understood - since any electronic document content is displayed one page/screen at a time on computer monitor, or display of a device, for easy viewing).

As per **claim 64**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 61, wherein providing the second version further comprises:

- sending the entire user-selected document content to the user at one-time (understood - as the user selects the document content to print, copy, or save, the content is sent to the user/printer/copy device, as a whole {i.e., entire} all at once).

As per **claim 66**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method recited in claim 65 wherein calculating the charge further comprises:

- calculating the charge on the bases of the user-selected portion including text and on the basis of the user selected portion including graphics (inherently included in the softcopy book(s)).

As per **claim 67**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing the purchase of information from a server, comprising:

- serving user-requested pages of information from a server in a protected form permitting user viewing of the actual contents of said pages of information and selecting by a user but not printing, copying or saving by the user (i.e., the user also applies a royalty payment program in conjunction with the softcopy book reading program. If the user enters a command to copy ... or to print ... or to transmit a copy of the book over a modem, the royalty payment program intercepts the copying command and suspends the copying operations – see col. 4, lines 58-65);
- calculating a charge to permit a requested action to be performed on a user-selected portion of the information served (i.e., Instead, the royalty payment program presents the user with a display of the royalty payment information stored in the book text or in a file accompanying the book. The user must select the option of paying a royalty to the publisher before the royalty payment program permits a copy of the book to be made – see col. 4, lines 65-67; col. 5, lines 1-3); and
- providing the user-selected portion, upon authorization of payment of the calculated charge in a second form on which the requested action is performed (i.e., After checking that the user's offered mode of payment is effective, the publisher's data processor sends back to the user's royalty payment program an authorization message to make the proposed copy. The royalty

payment program in the user's workstation then recommences the copying operation which was suspended, allowing the proposed copy of the book to be made – see col. 5, lines 26-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. §103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> *(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.*

Claims 57-58, 70-72, 75, 78-85 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,532,920, published on 02 July 1996 in view of Allen, U.S. Patent no. 6,041,316 published on 21 March 2000.

As per **claims 57, 70, 78, 80, 81, 82 and 84**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claims 1, or 67 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method wherein providing the first user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document content at a resolution sufficient for viewing and selecting by the user, but not for satisfactory completion of the requested action, nor sufficient for acceptable printing, copying, saving by the user.

Allen, however, teaches a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 1 above, wherein providing the first user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document content at a resolution sufficient for viewing and selecting by the user, but not for satisfactory completion of the requested action, nor sufficient for acceptable printing, copying, saving by the user (i.e., A partially-degraded version is defined herein as a version which, when displayed, printed, played, run or otherwise utilized at the user terminal, is substantially recognizable to the customer as a particular type of data and is therefore suitable

for use in browsing and/or research or for other purposes which do not require full resolution undegraded data – see col. 4, lines 28-34), to determine if the data is of sufficient importance or desirability to justify the payment of a royalty to obtain a higher quality or undegraded version (see col. 4, lines 37-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing document content at a resolution sufficient for viewing and selecting by the user, but not for satisfactory completion of the requested action, nor sufficient for acceptable printing, copying, saving by the user*' taught by Allen. to determine if the data is of sufficient importance or desirability to justify the payment of a royalty to obtain a higher quality or undegraded version (see Allen, col. 4, lines 37-40).

As per **claims 58, 72, 75, 79 and 83**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claims 57, 71, 78, or 80 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method wherein providing the second user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document content in a higher resolution on which satisfactory completion of the requested action such as printing, copying and/or saving, may be performed.

Allen, however, teaches a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 57 above, wherein providing the second user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document content in a higher resolution on which satisfactory completion of the requested action such as printing, copying and/or saving, may be performed (i.e., The temporary storage 48 facilitates the transfer of remaining data, or transfer of a higher quality or complete undegraded version of the data, to the customer upon payment of a fee – see col. 4, lines 41-64), to get better and acceptable quality of data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content

using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing document content in a higher resolution on which satisfactory completion of the requested action such as printing, copying and/or saving, may be performed*', taught by Allen to get better and acceptable quality of data.

As per **claim 71**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations recited in claim 70 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, wherein providing user-selected portion further comprises:

- providing text within the user-selected portion of the low-resolution images in the form of text on which the action may be performed.

Allen, however, teaches a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations recited in claim 70 above, wherein providing user-selected portion further comprises:

- providing text within the user-selected portion of the low-resolution images in the form of text on which the action may be performed (i.e., Alternatively, comments could be added to beginning or end of the partially-degraded version of audio data, such as music, and/or at one or more points within the data – see col. 8, lines 15-17).

to add annotation, notes or sub-notes for further explanations.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing text within the user-selected portion of the low-resolution images in the form of text on which the action may be performed*', taught by Allen to add annotation, notes or sub-notes for further explanations..

As per **claim 85**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 84 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method wherein providing the user-selected portion further comprises:

- providing the user-selected text in the form of text suitable for the requested action; and
- providing images in the form of high-resolution images suitable for performing the requested action.

Allen, however, teaches a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 84 above, wherein providing the user-selected portion further comprises:

- providing the user-selected text in the form of text suitable for the requested action; and
- providing images in the form of high-resolution images suitable for performing the requested action.

(i.e., The temporary storage 48 facilitates the transfer of the desired {user-selected} remaining data, or transfer of a higher quality or complete undegraded version of the data, to the customer upon payment of a fee – see col. 4, lines 41-64), to get better and acceptable quality of data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing the user-selected text in the form of text suitable for the requested action; and providing images in the form of high-resolution images suitable for performing the requested action*', taught by Allen to get better and acceptable quality of data.

Claims 19, 20, 55, 60, 61, 73, 74 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,532,920, published on 02 July 1996 in view of Berstis et al., U.S. Patent no. 6,282,653 B1 published on 28 August 2001.

As per **claim 19**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 1 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method further comprising:

- determining whether a user wants multiple copies of said document; and
- calculating a charge for said multiple copies of said document.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 1 above, further comprising:

- determining whether a user wants multiple copies of said document (i.e., Thus, for example, the copy control information may define a set of payment options including, without limitation,

prepayment {for "n" copies}, pay-per-copy {as each copy is made}, IOU {for copies made offline}, ... , a count of the number of permitted copies ... – see col. 3, lines 15-22); and

- calculating a charge for said multiple copies of said document (i.e., Thus, for example, the copy control information may define a set of payment options including, without limitation, prepayment {for "n" copies}, pay-per-copy {as each copy is made}, IOU {for copies made offline}, ... , a count of the number of permitted copies ... – see col. 3, lines 15-22).

to ensure fair, appropriate compensation for the content authors, publishers, and others for their content.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*determining whether a user wants multiple copies of said document, and calculating a charge for said multiple copies of said document*' taught by Berstis et al. to ensure fair, appropriate compensation for the content authors, publishers, and others for their content.

As per **claim 20**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 19 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method further comprising:

- providing a certificate allowing authorized reproduction of a number of copies.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 19 above, further comprising:

- providing a certificate allowing authorized reproduction of a number of copies (i.e., device certificate – see col. 6, lines 10-35).

to ensure that the copy restrictions (such as set forth in the copy control information) may be enforced.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing a certificate allowing authorized reproduction of a number of copies*' taught by Berstis et al. to ensure that the copy restrictions (such as set forth in the copy control information) may be enforced.

As per **claim 55**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claims 1 and 2 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, wherein providing the first user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document contents to the user in an encrypted format.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claims 1 and 2 above, wherein providing the first user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document contents to the user in an encrypted format (i.e., encrypted digital file – see figure 3).

to prevent unauthorized access to contents/documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing document contents to the user in an encrypted format*' taught by Berstis et al. to prevent unauthorized access to contents/documents.

As per **claim 60**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claims 1 and 2 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, wherein providing the first user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document content in a form viewable by the user only upon authorization from a third party.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claims 1 and 2 above, wherein providing the first user viewable version further comprises:

- providing document content in a form viewable by the user only upon authorization from a third party (i.e., Generalizing, prior to transfer ..., that transfer must be authorized and the transfer itself is then capable of being associated with some royalty payment {understood, from a third-party} then due to a content provider for use of such file – see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 5, lines 50-63).

to ensure compensation for contents authors, publishers, and others, for use of their contents/documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing document content in a form viewable by the user only upon authorization from a third-party*' taught by Berstis et al. to ensure compensation for contents authors, publishers, and others, etc., for use of their contents/documents.

As per **claim 61**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 60 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, wherein providing document content in a form viewable by the user only upon authorization from a third-party further comprises:

- providing authorization for viewing by the user only as the document content is being provided from the server.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 60 above, wherein providing document content in a form viewable by the user only upon authorization from a third-party further comprises:

- providing authorization for viewing by the user only as the document content is being provided from the server (i.e., Generalizing, prior to transfer of a given digital file [or set of files, or file component] from the source {understood, as the content/Web server} ..., that transfer must be authorized and the transfer itself is then capable of being associated with some royalty payment {understood, from a third-party} then due to a content provider for use of such file – see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 5, lines 50-63).

to ensure compensation for the contents authors, publishers, and others, for use of their contents/documents.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*providing authorization for viewing by the user*

only as the document content is being provided from the server' taught by Berstis et al. to ensure compensation for the contents authors, publishers, and others, etc., for use of their contents/documents.

As per **claims 73 and 74**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim {67, 68, or 69} above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, further comprising:

- encrypting the serving user-requested/selected pages/portion of information before serving them to the user; and
- requiring authorization from a third party before permitting viewing and selecting of user-requested/selected pages/portion by the user.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim {67, 68, or 69} above, further comprising:

- encrypting the serving user-requested/selected pages/portion of information before serving them to the user (i.e., encrypted digital file – see figure 3); and
- requiring authorization from a third party before permitting viewing and selecting of user-requested/selected pages/portion by the user (i.e., Generalizing, prior to transfer of a given digital file [or set of files, or file component] from the source {understood, as the content/Web server} ..., that transfer must be authorized and the transfer itself is then capable of being associated with some royalty payment {understood, from a third-party} then due to a content provider for use of such file – see col. 7, lines 22-29; col. 5, lines 50-63).

to prevent unauthorized access to contents/documents, and ensure compensation for contents authors, publishers, and others, for use of their contents/documents, respectively.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*encrypting the serving user-requested/selected pages/portion of information before serving them to the user; and requiring authorization from a third party before permitting viewing and selecting of user-requested/selected pages/portion by the user*' taught by

Berstis et al. to prevent unauthorized access to contents/documents, and ensure compensation for contents authors, publishers, and others, for use of their contents/documents, respectively.

Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,532,920, published on 02 July 1996 in view of Satoh, U.S. Patent no. 6,327,600 published on 04 December 2001.

- As per **claim 21**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 1 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method '*wherein the user-selected portion may include an anthology from multiple documents*'.

Berstis et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations described in claim 1 above, '*wherein the user-selected portion may include an anthology from multiple documents*' (i.e., When the user requests to use a prescribed portion of another document other than the document that the user is presently producing, a use-allowed part is determined within the prescribed portion on the basis of the copyright management information of the constituent element overlapping with the prescribed portion – see col. 2, lines 12-18), to retrieve as many occurrences ("hits") as possible.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include '*wherein the user-selected portion may include an anthology from multiple documents*' taught by Berstis et al. to retrieve as many occurrences ("hits") as possible.

Claims 62 and 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hartrick et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,532,920, published on 02 July 1996 in view of Rivette et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,991,780 published on 23 November 1999.

As per **claim 62**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations recited in claim 60 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, wherein providing the first version further comprises:

- providing a full-text searchable version of said document content; and
- displaying documents opened for browsing to portions containing search terms which are highlighted.

Rivette et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations recited in claim 60 above, wherein providing the first version further comprises:

- providing a full-text searchable version of said document content (i.e., The user may then, for example, use the GUI to perform text searches to generate accurate column and line citations, navigate the Equivalent File via section headings to locate desired sections of text, as well as to view the figures or text images in the displayed files or other stored files – see col. 10, lines 31-36); and
- displaying documents opened for browsing to portions containing search terms which are highlighted (i.e., ...to locate desired sections of text – see col. 10, lines 31-36; or, Upon completion of the search, all occurrences {"hits"} of the search string will be highlighted in the text of the Equivalent File displayed in the equivalent window 160 in figure 28 – see col. 24, lines 27-30).

to get attention of the searcher/user on the retrieving text/search result.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include, wherein providing the first version further comprises:

- providing a full-text searchable version of said document content; and
- displaying documents opened for browsing to portions containing search terms which are highlighted.

taught by Rivette et al. to get attention of the searcher/user on the retrieving text/search result.

As per **claim 65**, Hartrick et al. disclose a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations recited in claim 1 or 2 above. Hartrick et al. do not expressly disclose such method, a method recited in claim 1 or 2, wherein providing the second version further comprises:

- providing text in a first structure, and graphics in a different structure.

Rivette et al., however, teach a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device comprising all the limitations recited in claim 1 or 2 above, wherein providing the second version further comprises:

- providing text in a first structure, and graphics in a different structure (i.e., The user-interface selectively displays the patent text file, ..., such that at least a portion of the patent *text* file is displayed in a first window, and at least a portion of the patent *image* file is displayed in a second window – see *Abstract*, last sentence).

to easily and conveniently navigate and manipulate the document.

Therefore, it would have been obvious and motivated for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to modify a method for allowing a user to access document content using a logic device disclosed by Hartrick et al. to include, *'providing text in a first structure, and graphics in a different structure'*, taught by Rivette et al. to easily and conveniently navigate and manipulate a document.

Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NANCY LOAN T. LE whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7066**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JAMES P. TRAMMELL can be reached on **(571) 272-6712**. ***For official/regular communication***, the fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **(571) 273-8300**. ***For informal/draft communication***, the fax number is **(571) 273-7066 (rightfax)**.

9. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see **http://pair-direct.uspto.gov**. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at **866-217-9197 (toll-free).**

10. Any response to this action should be *mailed* to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

11. Hand delivered responses should be brought to:

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Customer Service Window

Randolph Building

401 Dulany Street

Alexandria, VA 22314

NL

16 September 2005

PRIMARY EXAMINER